



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,173	02/17/2004	Yuh-Cherng Wu	13906-139001 / 2003P00611	1739
32864	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			KIM, PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,173	WU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Kim	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/17/04, 4/1/04, 7/25/05, 2/23/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2161

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed on 25 August 2006.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending and present for examination.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction requirement mailed 8 August 2006 in the reply filed on 25 August 2006 is acknowledged. This is found persuasive and the restriction requirement is withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 17 February 2004, 1 April 2004, 25 July 2005 and 23 February 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-10, 12-17 and 19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lei (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,552, hereinafter referred to as LEI), filed on 5 October 1998, and issued on 26 November 2002.

7. **As per independent claims 1, 19 and 21, LEI teaches:**

A computer-implemented method for retrieving information from a knowledge base, the method comprising:

building a search request that contains a search query and a pattern having a set of attributes {See LEI, C14:L4-32, wherein this reads over "[t]he policy function then selectively adds one or more predicates to the received query"}; and

using the search request to retrieve information from the knowledge base, wherein the retrieved information contains information associated with the search query, and wherein the retrieved information is also associated with the set of attributes contained in the pattern {See LEI, C13:L55-C14:L32, wherein this reads over "[d]ynamic predicate attachment involves selectively adding predicates to queries that access database objects, such as tables and views"}.

8. **As per dependent claim 2, LEI teaches:**

The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the search query is input by a user {See LEI, C1:L52-61, wherein this reads over "views may be queried by users"}.

9. **As per dependent claim 3, LEI teaches:**

The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the method comprises:

using the search request to retrieve information from the knowledge base using a search index {See LEI, C7:L37-40, wherein this reads over "[i]f department is a indexed column, the execution plan for the query call the My_department function . . . but it will only be an indexed lookup for the query that invokes GetContextValue."}.

10. **As per dependent claim 4, it would be inherent for the search query to include knowledge**

base search terms since without the inclusion of the search terms, the search query would not be able to return any relevant data pertinent to the search query.

11. **As per dependent claim 5, LEI teaches:**

The computer-implemented method of claim 4, wherein the knowledge base search terms contain textual search terms {See LEI, C12:L12-55, wherein this reads over "SELECT * from t WHERE t.lang=GetContextValue(mysession, language)"}.

12. **As per dependent claims 6 and 13, LEI teaches:**

The computer-implemented method of claim 12, wherein the search strategy is associated with one or more control entities {See LEI, C11:L13-29, wherein this reads over "a security policy may allow special classes of users to have special context modification privileges, or have special rules that govern certain types of context attributes"}.

13. **As per dependent claims 7 and 14, LEI teaches:**

Art Unit: 2161

The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the control entities are each selected from a group consisting of a user name, a country code, a region, and a organization {See LEI, C11:L13-29, wherein this reads over "a security policy may allow special classes of users to have special context modification privileges ", "a security_level attribute may have the rule that everyone except the CEO may only decrease the attribute value" and "[i]f the current user is not the CEO, then procedure 250 reads the current value of the security_level attribute"}.

14. As per dependent claims 8 and 15, LEI teaches:

The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the pattern contains a set of attributes that each have a name/value pair {See LEI, C12:L4-10, wherein this reads over "[t]he attributes included in the USERENV namespace may include, but are not limited to: the identity of the logon user"; and C12:L12-55, wherein this reads over "GetContextValue(<namespace>,<attribute>)"}.

15. As per dependent claims 9 and 16, LEI teaches:

The computer-implemented method of claim 12, wherein the method further comprises:

using the search strategy to build a second pattern having a set of attributes to be used when searching for information in the knowledge base, such that the information is associated with the set of attributes in the pattern and also with the set of attributes in the second pattern {See LEI, C14:L4-32, wherein this reads over "the database server 212 invokes a policy function that has been bound to table t. The policy function then selectively adds one or more predicates to the received query", "SELECT * from t", "SELECT * from t WHERE t.lang=GetContextValue(language)", and "[t]he logic implemented in the policy function to determine which predicates, if any, should be appended to incoming queries may be arbitrarily complex"}.

16. As per dependent claims 10 and 17, LEI teaches:

The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the set of attributes contained in the pattern includes attributes selected from a group consisting of a symptom type, a status, a validation category, a priority type, and a priority level {See LEI, C14:L4-32, wherein this reads over "assume that access to table t is only allowed on weekdays (Monday-Friday), unless the access is performed by a database administrator"}.

17. As per independent claims 12, 20 and 22, LEI teaches:

A computer-implemented method for building a request to search for information in a knowledge base, the method comprising:

obtaining a search strategy that is associated with the knowledge base {See LEI, C13:L55-C14:L32, wherein this reads over "dynamic predicate attachment"; and C16:L24-33, wherein this reads over "a policy function can produce a filtering predicate for a particular table of view object based on the current state of the user session"}; and

using the search strategy to build a pattern having a set of attributes to be used when searching for information in the knowledge base, such that the information is associated with the set of attributes in the pattern {See LEI, C13:L55-C14:L32, wherein this reads over "[d]ynamic predicate attachment involves selectively adding predicates to queries that access database objects, such as tables and views"}.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. **Claims 11 and 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEI, in view of Official Notice.

20. **As per dependent claims 11 and 18**, LEI, in combination with Official Notice, discloses a method wherein the knowledge base is selected from a group consisting of a problem knowledge base, a solution knowledge base, and a business partner knowledge base. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a knowledge base from a group consisting of the aforementioned knowledge bases since a user may desire to access problems of a given problem type and consequently a solution knowledge base to find a correlated solution to the problem.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chase can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Kim
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161
TECH Center 2100



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER